

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are in the case and presented for consideration.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,117,931 to Alexander, et al. in view of Masahiro, et al. (JP 2000-307993). The Examiner's reasons for the rejection are set forth on pages 3-4 of the January 17, 2006 Office Action.

In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's above ground of rejection.

Claim 1, for example, recites:

1. A method for searching for television programs comprising the steps of:

identifying at least one key object in at least one Internet document by means of a personal computing device that initiated a request for said at least one Internet document, wherein said key object represents a topic of interest and said at least one Internet document is not related to said television programs;

sending said at least one key object from said device to a search capable video recorder; and

conducting a key object search with said search capable video recorder to locate at least one television program that contains said at least one key object.

The Examiner acknowledges that Alexander, et al. do not teach "identifying at least one key object in at least one Internet document, wherein said key object represents a topic of interest and said at least one Internet document is not related to said television program." See pages 3 of the January 17, 2006 Office Action.

Masahiro, et al. teach that the extraction of the content of a file object always require the use of an intermediary device that acts as an interface between the requesting device

and the network or Internet, such as a proxy or gateway server. See, e.g., Masahiro, et al., paragraphs 18-20.

Alexander, et al. and Masahiro, et al., therefore, cannot render the claimed invention obvious because the method as proposed by the Examiner does not disclose, teach or suggest, for example, identifying key object(s) in an Internet document and/or compiling a list of key object(s) during an Internet session, **using the client or personal computing device that initiated the request for the selected Internet document.** See, e.g., page 11, lines 3-9, 17-21, page 12, lines 6-9, of the specification. Rather, Alexander, et al. disclose using information provided on the television to identify related information on the Internet. And, as mentioned previously, Masahiro, et al. disclose using a proxy or gateway server to extract the content of a file object. See, e.g., Masahiro, et al., paragraphs 18-20.

A claim is obvious only if the applied references teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The proposed method extracts contents from a file object at the interface between the network on which the requesting client machine resides and, e.g., the Internet where the selected file object is located. Without employing an intermediary device, the proposed method will not function properly, if at all. In contrast, Applicants' claimed method provides, for example, greater versatility in the identification of key objects in an Internet document, which does not depend on the configuration of the communication network, or whether the appropriate intermediary device is present.

In addition, Alexander, et al. and Masahiro, et al., alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, e.g., retaining the key objects identified or retrieved from an Internet document on the device that initiated the request for the Internet document (see, e.g., page 18, lines 9-11, of the specification) and sending the key objects from the requesting device to, e.g., a personal video recorder. See, e.g., page 11, lines 3-9, of the specification.


For these reasons (see discussion above), Alexander, et al. and Masahiro, et al. cannot render Applicants' claimed invention obvious. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

With regards to claims 11, 14, 17, 22 and 24, these claims recite subject matter similar to that recited in claims 1, 13 and 19, and were rejected for the same reasons used to reject claims 1, 13 and 19. For the remarks made in response to the rejection of claims 1, 13 and 19, which are also applicable and reasserted, as if in full, herein, in response to the rejection of claims 11, 14, 17, 22 and 24, it is believed that the reasons for rejecting these claims have been overcome.

Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below to advance the application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Chih-Sheng Lin  
Reg. No. 56,402  
Attorney for Applicants  
ph. (845) 359-7700

Dated: March 28, 2006

**NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.**  
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110  
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

**Customer No. 21706**

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
Yan Glickberg, Registration No. 51,742  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9608  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

F:\TEXT\PATAMDU741-025US-AMD-Filed.wpd